UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,767	05/14/2001	Sebastien A. Jean	36.P318	6641

5514 7590 10/20/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
LEE, PHILIP C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/853,767	JEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip C. Lee	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on September 9, 2005.

2. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

3. Claims 2-32 and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

i. As per claims 2-32, 37 and 39, line 1, it is unclear if "A method" refers to "A method" of claim 1, line 1 [i.e. if they are the same, then "The method" must be used].

ii. As per claims 38 and 40, line 1, it is unclear if "A method" refers to "A method" of claim 33, line 1 [i.e. if they are the same, then "The method" must be used].

iii. As per claim 34, lines 6-7, it is uncertain which claims is being performed [i.e. for example, if claims 1 and 38 is to be performed, and since claim 1 is an

independent claim and claim 38 depend on another independent claim 33, it is unclear which independent claim is being performed?]

iv. As per claim 35, lines 6-7, it has the same uncertainty as set forth in claim 34 above.

v. As per claim 36, lines 6-7, it has the same uncertainty as set forth in claim 34 above.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, "A computer-readable medium" can be interpreted as a carrier wave, which is a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3, 34-37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng et al, U.S. Patent 6,240,456 (hereinafter Teng) in view of Tomiyasu, U.S. Patent 6,727,998 (hereinafter Tomiyasu).

8. Teng and Tomiyasu were cited in the last office action.

9. As per claims 1 and 34-36, Teng taught the method substantially as claimed for mimicking network devices, the method being performed in a computing device [e.g. 49, fig. 1] having first and second network interface cards [Note that remove computer 49 in figure 1 is connected with Wide Area Network 52 (e.g. internet) and LAN 51, therefore it is inherent that remove computer 49 have two network interface cards.], the first network interface card connecting the computing device to an external network [e.g. 52, fig. 1] and the second network interface card connecting the computing device to a local network [LAN 51, fig. 1], the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming message from a client network device residing on the external network, the incoming message being addressed to a target network device (col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 6, lines 63-67);

determining if an application module (e.g. installable component 126) residing in the computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by the incoming message (col. 8, lines 60-67);

redirecting the incoming message to the application module in the case that the application module is configured to process the functionality (col. 8, line 60-col. 9, line 10); and

passing the incoming message to the target network device in the case that the application module is not configured to process the functionality (col. 7, lines 1-9).

10. Teng did not teach a target network device resides on a local network. Tomiyasu taught a similar method comprising a target network device residing on a local network (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 3-10).

11. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng and Tomiyasu because Tomiyasu's teaching of a target network device residing on a local network would increase the efficiency of Teng's system by allowing a target network device to be share by all of the users in a local network.

12. As per claims 3 and 39, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Teng further taught that in the redirecting step, the processing of the functionality by the application module includes sending a local message from the application module over the local network to the target network device which performs a function in response to the local message (col. 9, lines 1-10).

13. As per claim 37, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Teng further taught wherein the target network device is a legacy network device (50, fig. 2).

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng and Tomiyasu in view of Wilson, Jr., U.S. Patent 6,757,280 (hereinafter Wilson).

15. Wilson was cited in the last office action.

16. As per claim 2, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Although Teng and Tomiyasu taught wherein the redirecting step, the processing of the functionality by the application module includes sending a response message from the application module over the external network to the client network device (col. 7, lines 10-34), Teng and Tomiyasu, however, did not teach sending a response message having a source address of network device to a client. Wilson taught a similar system wherein the application module includes sending a response message from the application module over the external network to

the client network device, the response message having a source identification address identical to a source identification address of the target network device (col. 9, lines 43-54).

17. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Wilson because Wilson's system of sending a response message having a source address of network device would increase the reliability of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by providing an acknowledgement to the requesting client.

18. Claims 16-21 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng and Tomiyasu in view of Krishnan, U.S. Patent 6,157,950 (hereinafter Krishnan).

19. Krishnan was cited in the last office action.

20. As per claims 16 and 18, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3 above. Teng and Tomiyasu did not teach that the second network interface card is assigned a preset IP address, and the local message contains the preset IP address as source address. Krishnan taught that the second network interface card is assigned a preset IP address, and the local message contains a source IP address which is identical to the preset IP address (col. 5, lines 10-21; col. 7,lines 4-6, 31-42).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan because Krishnan's method of using the IP address of the second network interface card as source address would increase the reliability of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by allowing message to be routed to a computer via a network interface card with an assigned IP address that identifies the computer.

22. As per claim 17, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3 above. Teng and Tomiyasu did not teach that the message contains the IP address of the client network device as source address. Krishnan taught that the local message contains a source IP address which is identical to a source IP address of the client network device (col. 7, lines 53-col. 8, lines 17).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan because Krishnan's teaching of local message having a source IP address of client network device would increase the reliability of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by allowing a gateway to identify the client network device that sent the local message.

24. As per claim 19, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Teng and Tomiyasu did not teach determining which one of the external network and the local network is used for sending the outbound message. Krishnan taught that in the redirecting step, the processing of the functionality by the application module includes

preparation of an outbound message for delivery to a designated device on one of the external network and the local network, and a routing table is used to determine which one of the external network and the local network is used for sending the outbound message to the designated device (col. 7, lines 53-col. 8, lines 39).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan because Krishnan's method of determining the path for the outbound message would increase the efficiency of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by providing the shortest path for sending the outbound message to the destination.

26. As per claim 20, Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 19 above. Krishnan further taught that the routing table contains a cross-reference indicator for each target network device to indicate which one of the external network and the local network is used for sending the outbound message to the designated device (col. 7, lines 53-col. 8, lines 39).

27. As per claim 21, Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 19 above. Krishnan further taught that the routing table is used to determine whether a preset IP address of the second network interface card or a source IP address of the client network device is used as a source IP address in the outbound message (col. 7, lines 53-col. 8, lines 39).

28. As per claim 32, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Teng and Tomiyasu did not teach sending a plurality of undesirable messages over one of the external network and the local network. Krishnan taught including the step of transmitting a plurality of undesirable messages from the application module over one of the external network and the local network (col. 8, lines 25-39; col. 9, lines 12-36).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Krishnan because Krishnan's method of sending undesirable message to external network and the local network would increase the reliability of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by allowing unidentified message to be routed to the destination.

30. Claims 4-10, 15, 24, 26, 28, 33, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng and Tomiyasu in view of, Banginwar, U.S. Patent 6,611,863 (hereinafter Banginwar).

31. Banginwar was cited in the last office action.

32. As per claims 4, 26 and 28, Teng and Tomiyasu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Teng and Tomiyasu did not teach rules for determining if the incoming message requires a function. Banginwar taught that in the determining step, inbound

rules are used to determine if the functionality is to be processed by an application module residing in the computing device (col. 2, lines 18-26).

33. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar because Banginwar's teaching of inbound rules would increase the user flexibility of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by allowing an incoming message to be process according to predetermined rules set by the user.

34. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not specifically disclose detailing an inbound rules table. However, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include an inbound rules table because doing so would increase the field of use in their systems.

35. As per claim 5, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Banginwar further taught that the inbound rules table contains a plurality of rules, each rule corresponding to one of a plurality of target network devices on the local network (col. 1, lines 60-col.2, lines 12; col. 5, lines 7-29).

36. As per claim 6, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 5 above. Banginwar further taught a system comprising the step of discovering each of the plurality of target network devices on the local network by listening to the local

network for messages from the target network devices, creating a target descriptor entry corresponding to each discovered target network device in a target descriptor table, and creating a rule corresponding to each target descriptor entry in the inbound rules table (col. 1, lines 60-col. 2, lines 12; col. 4, lines 10-45; col. 5, lines 7-29).

37. As per claims 7 and 8, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6 above. Banginwar further taught a system wherein the inbound rules table contains at least one rule which indicates whether a functionality requested for a corresponding target network device to perform is to be processed by an application module residing in the computing device (col. 2, lines 18-26).

38. As per claim 9, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7 above. Banginwar further taught a system wherein each rule contains an IP address of the target network device corresponding to the rule to indicate whether a functionality requested for the corresponding target network device to perform is to be processed by an application module residing in the computing device (col. 4, lines 10-45, lines 54-58; col. 5, lines 7-29).

39. As per claim 10, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not specifically disclose detailing port identifier contained in each rule. However, Banginwar taught a system wherein each rule contains an IP address of the target network device (col. 4, lines 10-45, lines 54-58; col. 5, lines

7-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a port identifier because doing so would increase the field of use in their systems.

40. As per claim 15, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6 above. Banginwar further taught comprising the step of publishing each target descriptor entry to the application module (col. 2, lines 2-12).

41. As per claim 24, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not specifically disclose detailing a USB network. However, Tomiyasu taught the local network could be connected with a local communication line (col. 2, lines 46-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a network connected with USB because doing so would increase the field of use in their systems.

42. As per claim 33, Teng taught the invention substantially as claimed for mimicking network devices, the method being performed in a computing device [e.g. 49, fig. 1] having first and second network interface cards [Note that remove computer 49 in figure 1 is connected with Wide Area Network 52 (e.g. internet) and LAN 51, therefore it is inherent that remove computer 49 have two network interface cards.], the first network interface card connecting the computing device to an external network [e.g. 52, fig. 1] and the second network interface card connecting the computing device to a local network [LAN 51, fig. 1], the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming message from a client network device residing on the external network, the incoming message being addressed to an IP address (e.g. URL address that corresponds an IP address) of a designated target network printer (col. 2, lines 55-65; col. 6, lines 63-67);

determining, if the incoming message requests a functionality that the application module (e.g. installable component 126) is configured to perform (col. 8, line 60-col. 9, line 5);

redirecting, in the case that the incoming message requests a functionality that the application module is configured to perform, the incoming message to the application module which performs the requested functionality in response to the incoming message (col. 8, line 60-col. 9, line 10); and

passing, in the case that the incoming message does not request a functionality that the application module is configured to perform, the incoming message to the designated target network printer (col. 7, lines 1-9).

43. Teng did not teach a plurality of target network printers resides on a local network. Tomiyasu taught a similar method comprising a plurality of target network printers residing on a local network (fig. 1; col. 4, lines 3-10).

44. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng and Tomiyasu because Tomiyasu's teaching of a plurality of target network printer residing on a local network would increase the

efficiency of Teng's system by allowing a plurality of network printer to be shared with all of the users in a local network.

45. Teng and Tomiyasu fail to teach the step of discovering a plurality of target network printers and creating a rule for each of the discovered target network printers. Banginwar taught a similar system comprising the steps of:

discovering a plurality of target network printers on the local network by detecting messages on the local network from each of the plurality of target network printers (col. 1, lines 60-col. 2, lines 26); creating a rule in a rules table for each of the discovered target network printers, each rule containing the IP address of the corresponding target network printer (col. 1, lines 60-col. 2, lines 26; col. 5, lines 7-29) and indicating whether an application module in the computing device is configured to perform a function on behalf of the corresponding target network printer (col. 4, lines 10-45, 54-58; col. 5, lines 7-29).

46. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar because Banginwar's teaching of discovering legacy network printers would increase the system alertness of Teng's and Tomiyasu's systems by allowing new devices added to the system to be notify to the user.

47. As per claim 38, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. Teng further taught wherein the target network device is a legacy network device (50, fig. 2).

48. As per claim 40, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. Teng further taught wherein the passing step, the target network printer performs the requested functionality in response to the incoming message received from the computing device (col. 9, lines 1-10).

49. Claims 22-23, 25 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar in view of Krishnan.

50. As per claims 22 and 23, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach tracking port identifier and creating rule corresponding to the port identifier for redirecting message. Krishnan taught a system comprising the step of tracking a port identifier of a port opened by the application module and creating a rule in the inbound rules table corresponding to the port identifier, wherein in the determining step, the rule is used to redirect a message from the external network to the application module if the message contains the port identifier corresponding to the rule (col. 7, lines 53-col. 8, lines 39).

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Krishnan because Krishnan's method of tracking port identifier and creating rule corresponding to the port identifier for redirecting message would enhance Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by allowing multiple devices to be connected to the Internet through a shared connection (see, Krishnan, col. 1, lines 65-67).

52. As per claim 25, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not specifically teach a digital camera. Krishnan taught that other devices and peripherals could be accessed from a remote location (col. 1, lines 57-59).

53. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Krishnan because Krishnan's teaching of accessing a device such as a digital camera would increase the field of use in their system.

54. As per claim 29, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach a file server which sends file over the network. Krishnan taught that the application module is a file server which sends at least one file over the local network to the target network device and at least one file

over the external network to the client network device (col. 10, lines 27-33; col. 10, lines 66-col. 11, lines 1).

55. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Krishnan because Krishnan's teaching of a file server sending file over the external network would increase the field of use in their systems.

56. As per claim 30, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach recording the incoming message. Krishnan taught that the inbound rules table contains rules which are used in the determining step to determine that a set of designated incoming messages are copied to the application module which records each of the set of designated incoming messages (col. 8, lines 40-col. 9, lines 36).

57. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Krishnan because Krishnan's method of recording the incoming message would increase the user alertness of Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by allowing a user to monitor the messages received by the system.

58. As per claim 31, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach redirecting an undesirable message. Krishnan taught that inbound rules table contains rules which are used in the determining step to detect if the incoming message is an undesirable message (col. 8, lines 25-39; col. 9, lines 12-36), and in the case that the incoming message is an undesirable message, determining that the incoming message is to be processed by the application module (col. 8, lines 25-39; col. 9, lines 12-36), whereby the incoming message is redirected to the application module (col. 8, lines 25-39; col. 9, lines 12-36).

59. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Krishnan because Krishnan's detecting and redirecting an undesirable message would increase the reliability of Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by allowing unidentified message to be routed to the destination.

60. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar in view of Levine et al, U.S. Patent 6,020,973 (hereinafter Levine).

61. Levine was cited in the last office action.

62. As per claim 11, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not specifically disclose detailing

the discovering step. Levine taught a system wherein the discovering step includes sending a discovery message to each discovered target network device and receiving discovery information in response to the discovery message from the corresponding target network device, wherein the discovery information is placed in the target descriptor entry for the corresponding target network device (col. 12, lines 10-26; col. 13, lines 28-47).

63. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Levine because Levine's system of having the discovering step would increase the user alertness in Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by allowing the status of the target network devices to be acknowledged by the user.

64. As per claim 12, Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Levine taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 11 above. Levine further taught a similar system comprising a polling step of sending a discovery message on a periodic basis to each discovered target network device (col. 12, lines 10-26; col.13, lines 30-39), and receiving in response to the discovery message discovery information from the corresponding target network device (col. 12, lines 10-26; col.13, lines 30-39), wherein the target descriptor entry is updated with the newly received discovery information (col. 12, lines 10-26; col.13, lines 30-39).

65. As per claim 13, Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Levine taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 12 above. Banginwar further taught that in the case that

discovery information is not received in response to the discovery message for a particular one of the discovered target network devices, the target descriptor entry corresponding to the particular discovered target network device is deleted (col. 6, lines 10-31).

66. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Levine and Banginwar because Banginwar's method of deleting the target descriptor entry corresponding to a network device in the case that the discovery message is not received would increase the system alertness in Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Levine's systems by allowing the status of the network device to be updated using discovery message.

67. As per claim 14, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach sending a notification to the application module. Levine taught a system comprising the step of sending a notification to the application module for each discovered target network device, the notification containing information related to the target descriptor entry for the corresponding target network device (col. 12, lines 10-26).

68. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Levine because Levine's system of sending a notification would increase the system alertness in Teng's,

Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by allowing the status of the target network devices to be acknowledged by the application module.

69. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar in view of Remer et al, U.S. Patent 6,742,039 (hereinafter Remer).

70. Remer was cited in the last office action.

71. As per claim 27, Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 above. Teng, Tomiyasu and Banginwar did not teach the step of preventing transmission of the incoming messages. Remer taught that the inbound rules table contains rules which are used in the determining step to capture an incoming message from the external network (col. 3, lines 1-14; col. 5, lines 5-9) and further including the step of preventing transmission of the incoming message on the local network (col. 3, lines 1-14; col. 5, lines 5-9).

72. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Teng, Tomiyasu, Banginwar and Remer because Remer's teaching of preventing transmission of the incoming message would increase the security in Teng's, Tomiyasu's and Banginwar's systems by preventing an unauthorized messages to access a private network.

73. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40, filed 09/09/05, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

74. In the remarks, applicant argued that:

> (1) neither Teng nor Tomiyasu, alone nor in combination, disclose the feature of determining if an application module residing in a computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by an incoming message and, in the case that the application module is configured to process the functionality, the incoming message is redirected to the application module and further that the incoming message is passed through the local network to the target network device.

75. In response to point (1), Teng taught the feature of determining if an application module residing in a computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by an incoming message and, in the case that the application module is configured to process the functionality, the incoming message is redirected to the application module and further that the incoming message is passed through the local network to the target network device. Specifically, Teng taught a server scripting component 72 functions to parse HTTP POST requests (col. 7, lines 1-9) and request for gathering device information (col. 8, lines 14-23). In the case of HTTP POST request, the server scripting component passes the request to the target network device (i.e. printer) (col. 7, lines 1-9). In the case of request for gathering device information, the server scripting component redirects the request to an installable components 126 (i.e. application

module) (col. 8, 14-22; col. 8, line 62-col. 9, line 10). This means that the server scripting component must determine the type of request (i.e. HTTP POST or gathering device information). As shown in Figure 5, server scripting component 72 parses the request (inherently determining the type of request) and submits the request to the printer or redirects to the installable component 126 to respond to specialized information request by polling the printer. Accordingly, Teng taught determining if an application module residing in a computing device is configured to process a functionality requested by an incoming message and, in the case that the application module is configured to process the functionality, the incoming message is redirected to the application module (i.e. inherently determining the type of request by the server scripting component and , in the case that the installable components 126 is configured to poll the printer for information requested by the request, the request is redirected to the installable components 126) and further that the incoming message is passed through the local network to the target network device (i.e. passing the HTTP POST request to the target printer).

76. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P.L.

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER